don't think the American public trusts the Federal Government to do the job of securing the border and reforming the immigration service.

But we know that the Federal Government does have the capability to grant amnesty to people that are here illegally. So, hopefully, Congress will do its job, get organized, pass three separate bills so that we have border security; that we have an efficient, workable immigration services; and then down the road, we deal with what to do with the people that are here illegally in the U.S.

The American public expect it. They have expected it for a long time, and it's time for us to get about the people's business and resolve these three problems as efficiently and quickly as we can.

And that's just the way it is.

PRESIDENT SHOULD OVERRULE PROPOSED NEW STRATEGY OF GIVING WEAPONS TO SUNNI ARAB GROUPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-woman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, tonight I rise to demand that President Bush take immediate action as Commander in Chief to overrule a proposed new strategy in Iraq, a proposal that may put our troops in even greater danger in the days ahead.

The New York Times reported this morning that our commanders in Iraq are now planning to give weapons to Sunni Arab groups, weapons that may turn around and be used against our very own troops.

In the past, these Sunni groups have been allied with al Qaeda and have actually been suspected of being involved in attacks upon our troops. So why are we doing this? According to the Times, our commanders have reason to believe that the Sunnis have split with al Qaeda and are now ready to fight on our side. Well, it could be true, but this strategy is fraught with terrible peril for our brave men and women in combat

The Times reports, "Critics of the strategy, including some American officers, say it could amount to the Americans arming both sides in a future civil war. The United States has spent more than \$15 billion in building up Iraq's Army and police force, whose manpower of 350,000 is heavily Shiite. With little sign of a political accommodation between Shiites and Sunni politicians in Baghdad, there is a risk that any weapons given to Sunni groups will eventually be used against Shiites." And I must mention, our troops will be stuck in the middle, dying for what? Because there is the possibility, says the Times, the weapons could be used against the Americans themselves.

Let me repeat that last sentence, "There is also the possibility the weapons could be used against the Americans themselves." That's what the Times had to say.

But first, Madam Speaker, we sent our troops into battle without the proper body armor or vehicle armor. Then we put them in the middle of a bloody civil war they were never trained to fight. Then, when many of them got wounded, we gave them terrible medical treatment at home. Now this is the latest outrage.

Madam Speaker, I do not condemn our commanders in the field for making this decision. They are taking this risk because they are desperate to implement President Bush's hopeless, foolish surge policy, but the surge has not worked, is not working and will not work.

As the Times reports, "An initial decline in sectarian killings in Baghdad in the first two months of the troop buildup has reversed, with growing numbers of bodies showing up each day in the capital. Suicide bombings have dipped in Baghdad, but increased elsewhere, as al Qaeda groups, confronted with great American troop numbers, have shifted their operations elsewhere."

There's only one way, Madam Speaker, out of this. We must bring our troops home, and then we must work with the Iraqi people and we must work with them in a peaceful way to reconstruct their devastated Nation.

Last month, a bill that called for starting the withdrawal of our troops within 90 days received 171 votes in this House. Some pundits were surprised that it received that much support. I wasn't. Opposition to this President's failed foreign policy is growing all over America, and those voices are eventually being heard in this body more and more every day.

Madam Speaker, if American troops are harmed by this new war strategy, then the American people will hold the President accountable. But if we in this House condone it as well, or remain silent, then we will be responsible too.

Our job is to force this administration to fully fund the plan to bring our troops and our contractors home, home where they are not positioned in the middle of a civil war.

SUPPORTING THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE FOR ACCUSED CAMP PENDLETON TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, only those who have been to war can truly understand the hell of war. I have not been to war, but I have spoken to those who have served our country in both Iraq and Afghanistan. I know enough to understand that those who serve in harm's way face grave dangers, and they are under extreme pressure.

Most of us cannot imagine the stress that those in uniform undergo when

they have to make a split-second decision whether to fire or be fired upon, to kill or be killed.

In June 2006, seven Marines and one Navy corpsman from Camp Pendleton were charged with murder in an April 2006 incident involving the death of an Iraqi man. The troops were staking out an intersection while looking for insurgents placing explosives along the road.

The squad of eight is accused of kidnapping the Iraqi man from a nearby home, killing him, and then staging the scene to frame him as an insurgent planting a bomb.

Four of the troops struck plea deals and received sentences of 21 months or less in exchange for their testimony against their squad mates. One of the troops also pled guilty to lesser charges but received an 8-year sentence. The three remaining Marines all face courts martial this summer and life in prison if convicted of premeditated murder.

One of these three Marines is a constituent of Congressman BILL DELAHUNT, who brought the details of this case to my attention.

Madam Speaker, 3 years ago, I came to this floor night after night to speak about what I felt was an unfair prosecution of Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a Marine who was charged with shooting an insurgent in Iraq. Not because of my concern, but because the charges against Lieutenant Pantano were not justified, the Marine Corps dropped the charges.

Because of my great respect for the men and women who serve in the United States Marine Corps, it is my hope that these Marines will receive the due process and justice they deserve as American citizens and as he-

President Teddy Roosevelt once said, "A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards. More than that no man is entitled, and less than that no man shall have."

The same men and women who risk their lives to preserve the rights of all American citizens deserve the protection of those same rights. Those who fight for justice deserve justice in return.

Madam Speaker, our military servicemembers, the military family, and certainly these Marines, deserve no less.

And Madam Speaker, with that, I close by saying, God, please continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and please, God, continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)